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Abstract—Non-Gaussian continuous-variable quantum states represent a pivotal resource in many quantum information protocols. Production of such states can occur through photonic subtraction process either at the transmitter side prior to sending a state through the channel, or at the receiver side on receipt of a state that has traversed the channel. In the context of quantum protocols implemented over communication channels to and from Low-Earth-Orbit (LEO) satellites it is unclear what photonic subtraction set-up will provide for the best performance. In this work we show that for a popular version of continuous-variable Quantum Key Distribution between terrestrial stations and LEO satellites, photon subtraction at the transmitter side is the preferred set-up. Such a result is opposite to that found for fiber-based implementations. Our results have implications for all future space-based missions that seek to take advantage of the opportunities offered by non-Gaussian quantum states.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum Communications via satellite offers a paradigm shift in our ability to deploy quantum information protocols over very large scales, e.g. [1]–[4]. Propagation through the atmosphere to and from Low-Earth-Orbit (LEO) satellites can overcome the scourge of the roughly 100km limited distance that plagues point-to-point optical-fiber optical links and free-space-optical links. Indeed, in the past few years great strides have been made in regard to actual deployments of quantum communications via satellites [5]–[9]. These latter works on satellite-based quantum communications are largely based on the deployment of discrete-variable (DV) quantum information protocols, a technology that is dependent on the production of single-photon states.

Continuous-variable (CV) technology offers a different pathway to the implementation of quantum information protocols. The main advantage of CV technology over DV technology is that detection can be realized by more reliable, and more efficient homodyne (or heterodyne) detectors e.g., [10]–[13]. Indeed, it is argued by many that relative to DV detectors, CV based-detectors offer the promise of a more pragmatic route to higher secret key rates for certain QKD protocols, e.g. [14].

Currently, no experimental deployment of space-based CV quantum technology has been carried out, but this is expected to change soon (see [4] for review). CV technologies are largely based around so-called Gaussian states, e.g. [12], [13] - quantum states in which the quasi-probability distribution (the Wigner function) of the electromagnetic-field quadratures follow a Gaussian distribution. However, the use of non-Gaussian states in the implementation of CV quantum information protocols has also garnered interest, e.g. [15], [19]. Non-Gaussian operations such as photon subtraction (PS) [20]–[25] on a mode of an incoming two mode squeezed vacuum (TMSV) state can lead to higher levels of entanglement, potentially higher secret (QKD) key rates, as well as forming a pivotal resource for quantum error correction.

In this work we will focus on single PS as a means to produce non-Gaussian states. We will be specifically focussed on the question as to whether PS at the transmitter offers a better pathway to improved QKD (higher secret key rates) when propagation between ground stations and LEO satellites is considered. The answer to this question has important implications not only for future space-based implementations of CV-QKD protocols, but also potentially for other space-based quantum information protocols that utilize non-Gaussian states.

The structure of the remainder of this paper is as follows. In Section II, the nature of the quantum channel between terrestrial stations and LEO satellites is described. In Section III, a model for CV-QKD with PS at the transmitter is described, whilst in Section IV a system for PS at the receiver is described. In Section V our simulation results are presented comparing key rates produced from both systems. Finally, concluding results are provided in Section IV.

II. EARTH-SATELLITE CHANNELS

We consider the model of single uplink and single downlink satellite channels in an entanglement-based version of a CV-QKD protocol[4]. Our quantum information carrier will be a pulsed optical beam. For the uplink, we assume that Alice first prepares a TMSV state $A_0 - B_0$ at a ground station, subsequently sending one of her modes ($B_0$) to the satellite. For the downlink, the TMSV is prepared on the satellite with $B_0$ being sent to the ground station.

For optical signals in the uplink channel, the dominant loss mechanism will be beam-wander caused by turbulence in the Earth’s atmosphere [26]. Assuming the beam spatially fluctuates around the receiver’s center point, the fading of the signal as a consequence of the beam-wander can be described by a distribution of transmission coefficients $\eta$. The probability density distribution of these coefficients, $p(\eta)$, can be approximated well by the log-negative Weibull distribution, given by [28] [29].

¹Each entanglement-based QKD protocol has an equivalent prepare and measure scheme that will give, in theory, exactly the same results.
The latter three parameters are given by

$$p(\eta) = \frac{2L^2}{\sigma_b^2 \lambda h} \left(2 \ln \frac{\eta_0}{\eta} \right)^\left(\frac{3}{2}\right) \exp \left(- \frac{L^2}{2\sigma_b^2} \left(2 \ln \frac{\eta_0}{\eta} \right)^\left(\frac{3}{2}\right) \right)$$

for $\eta \in [0, \eta_0]$, with $p(\eta) = 0$ otherwise. Here, $\sigma_b^2$ is the beam wander variance, $\lambda$ is the shape parameter, $L$ is the scale parameter, and $\eta_0$ is the maximum transmission value. The latter three parameters are given by

$$\lambda = 8\beta \exp(-4h) \frac{I_1(4h)}{I_0(4h)} \left[ \ln \left( \frac{2}{1-\exp(-4h)I_0(4h)} \right) \right]^{-1}$$

$$L = \beta \left[ \ln \left( \frac{2}{1-\exp(-4h)I_0(4h)} \right) \right]^{-(1/\lambda)}$$

where $I_0[.]$ and $I_1[.]$ are the modified Bessel functions, and $h = (\beta r/W)^2$, with $\beta r$ being the aperture radius and $W$ the beam-spot radius.

In the downlink satellite channel diffraction effects are anticipated to dominate. This is largely because beam-wander in the downlink is relatively suppressed since the beam-width, on entry into the atmosphere from space, is generally broader than the scale of the turbulent eddies [26]. As such, with well-engineered designs[2] losses in the downlink can be as small as 5-10 dB, compared to the 20-30 dB losses that can be anticipated for well-engineered uplink channels.

To investigate the effect of the PS we mainly consider three schemes. The first scheme is where there is no PS (No-PS). The second scheme is PS at the transmitter side (T-PS), where the PS is performed immediately after Alice prepares her TMSV state. The last scheme is PS at the receiver side (R-PS), where Bob performs the PS after he receives the mode from Alice, but before his homodyne measurement. We will adopt a QKD scheme of reverse reconciliation at Alice, in which both Alice and Bob undertake homodyne measurements. We will assume the asymptotic limit in the number of measurements taken.

III. PHOTON SUBTRACTION AT TRANSMITTER SIDE

The system model for the CV-QKD protocol with photon subtraction is illustrated in Fig. 1. We assume that Alice first prepares a TMSV $A_0 - B_0$ at her ground station (for brevity we just describe the uplink). She then sends one of her modes ($B_0$) through a PS process in which $B_0$ interacts with a mode $C_0$ at a beam-splitter with transmissivity $T_S$. One of the exiting modes ($C$) is sent to a photodetector (PD), whilst the other ($B_1$) is sent to Bob (the satellite). In the following we take mode $C_0$ to be a vacuum state[3].

In this work we assume that Eve performs a collective attack[4]. The channel can then be modeled by Eve feeding one mode, $E_0$, of a TMSV state ($E_0-F$) prepared by her into a beam-splitter with transmissivity $T_E$, sending $B_0$ through a PS process using a beam-splitter with transmissivity $T_S$. The exiting mode $C$ is sent to a photodetector, whilst the exiting $B_1$ is sent to Bob (the satellite). The channel is controlled by Eve using a second beam-splitter with Transmissivity $T_E$.

In the asymptotic limit, security under collective attacks can be shown to be equivalent to security under coherent attacks (the most general attack possible) in which Eve’s ancillary modes are no longer constrained to interact independently with Alice’s modes.
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Fig. 1. Photon subtraction at transmitter side (T-PS). Here Alice (ground station) prepares a TMSV $A_0 - B_0$, sending $B_0$ through a PS process using a beam-splitter with transmissivity $T_S$. The exiting mode $C$ is sent to a photodetector, whilst the exiting $B_1$ is sent to Bob (the satellite). The channel is controlled by Eve using a second beam-splitter with Transmissivity $T_E$.
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where $\theta$ represents the orientation of the squeezing, and where $\hat{a}$ and $\hat{a}^\dagger$ represent the annihilation and creation operators, respectively, of mode $a$. Here, we assume $\theta = 0$.

**Result 1:** The quantum state after the channel can be written as

$$|\psi\rangle_{ABzEF} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{P}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \times |n, n - 1 - k + l, l, m\rangle_{ABzEF} \times \beta_m |m, m\rangle_{E_F}|0, 0\rangle_{B_2E}$$

where $s_{n,k,m,l} = \alpha_n r_{n,k} = \beta_m r_{m,l} m, l, \to begin the form

$$\left(\begin{array}{c}
\langle n - k + l | \sqrt{k + m - l} \rangle
\end{array}\right)_{ABzEF}$$

The presence of the beam-splitter at Eve alters this combined mode to the form

$$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{P}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \times |n, n - 1 - k + l, l, m\rangle_{ABzEF} \times \beta_m |m, m\rangle_{E_F}|0, 0\rangle_{B_2E}$$

where $s_{n,k,m,l} = \alpha_n r_{n,k}$, and the other variables introduced above are defined in the following proof.

**Proof:** Initially we have the following description of the combined $AB_0C_0B_1C$ mode

$$|\psi\rangle_{AB_0C_0B_1C} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n |n, n\rangle_{AB_0}|0, 0, 0\rangle_{C_0B_1C}$$

The presence of the beam-splitter at the PS stage alters this combined mode to the form

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k r_{n,k} |n, n\rangle_{AB_0} |0, 0, 0\rangle_{C_0B_1C}$$

where $r_{n,k} = \sqrt{n/k}$. We assume that the subtraction is for the single photon case (i.e. $k = 1$ and $C = 1$). Tracing out $B_0$, $C$, and $C_0$ we have,

$$|\psi\rangle_{AB_1} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n r_{n,k} |n, n - 1\rangle_{AB_1}$$

where

$$P_1 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\alpha_n r_{n,k}\right)^2$$

is the probability of subtracting one photon. Similar to Alice, Eve’s initial TMSV state is,

$$|\psi\rangle_{E_F} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \beta_m |m, m\rangle_{E_F}$$

with

$$\beta_m = \sqrt{\frac{\beta^2 m}{1 + \beta^2} m + 1}$$

where $\beta^2$ is the mean photon number in each mode - a parameter used by Eve to simulate the channel noise.

As it passes the channel, mode $B_1$ evolves to mode $B_2$. Prior to Eve acting on the incoming states we have the following description of the combined $AB_1E_0EFB_2$ mode

$$|\psi\rangle_{AB_1E_0EFB_2} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n r_{n,k} |n, n - 1\rangle_{AB_1} \times \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \beta_m |m, m\rangle_{E_F}|0, 0\rangle_{B_2E}$$

The presence of the beam-splitter at Eve alters this combined mode to the form

$$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n r_{n,k} |n, n - 1\rangle_{AB_1} \times \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \beta_m |m, m\rangle_{E_F}|0, 0\rangle_{B_2E}$$

Rearranging the summation and tracing out $B_1$ and $E_0$ we arrive at the Result 1.

**IV. PHOTON SUBTRACTION AT RECEIVER SIDE**

If the photon subtraction occurs at the receiver side instead of the transmitter side (Fig. 2), a different outcome is achieved for the final state - a result previously derived in [30]. We simply provide that result here (the proof follows a similar path to that given for PS at the transmitter). However, we note the work of [30] considers the fixed-attenuation channel only, and therefore the results of that work cannot be directly utilized for the Earth-satellite channels we are concerned with here.

![Fig. 2. Photon subtraction at receiver side (R-PS). Here Alice (ground station) prepares a TMSV $A_1 - B_0$, sending $B_0$ through a channel controlled by Eve using a beam-splitter with transmissivity $T_S$. The exiting mode $B_1$ is sent by Eve to Bob (the satellite) who undertakes a PS process on $B_1$ using a beam-splitter with transmissivity $T_S$, leading to $B_2$.

Prior to the PS at the receiver the quantum state is given by

$$|\phi\rangle_{AB_1EF} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n (-1)^k r_{n,k} \times \beta_m r_{m,l} |n, n - k + l, k + m - l, m\rangle_{AB_1EF}$$

After the channel, Bob performs PS on $B_1$, leading to the $B_2$ mode. This latter mode is subsequently used in Bob’s homodyne detection.
Result 2: The photon subtracted quantum state at the receiver can be written
\[ |\phi\rangle_{AB2EF} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{P_1'}} \sum_{k,n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n (-1)^k \times n, n - k + l, l, k + m - l, m \rangle_{AB2EF} \]
where \( P_1' \) is a new normalization constant (cf. Eq. (19) of [30]).

V. PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

A. Covariance Matrix

Before moving into our investigation of the secret key rate we note that the covariance matrix of a given state \( |\psi\rangle_{AB} \) with two modes A and mode B, can be written as
\[ M_{AB} = \begin{bmatrix} V_A I & C_{AB} \sigma \\ C_{AB} \sigma & V_B I \end{bmatrix} \]
where \( I = \text{diag}(1,1) \), \( \sigma = \text{diag}(1,-1) \). Here,
\[ V_A = \langle |\psi\rangle | 1 + 2 \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} | \psi\rangle \]
is the variance of mode A, and
\[ C_{ab} = \langle | \hat{a} \hat{b} + \hat{b}^\dagger \hat{a} | \psi\rangle \]
is the covariance between mode A and mode B.

Consider next the variances of mode A and mode E following PS at the transmitter. Using the above, we can see that the variances of mode A and E can be given as,
\[ V_A = \langle |\psi\rangle | 1 + 2 \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} | \psi\rangle \]
where \( I = \text{diag}(1,1) \), \( \sigma = \text{diag}(1,-1) \). Here,
\[ V_A = \langle |\psi\rangle | 1 + 2 \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} | \psi\rangle \]
is the variance of mode A, and
\[ C_{ab} = \langle | \hat{a} \hat{b} + \hat{b}^\dagger \hat{a} | \psi\rangle \]
is the covariance between mode A and mode B.

B. The Secret Key Rate

Under a collective attack, the key rate is related to the difference of \( I(A : B_2) - \chi(B_2 : EF) \) - the mutual information between mode A and mode B; and \( \chi(B_2 : EF) \) - the Holevo information that Eve can extract from her measurement [13]. More specifically, we can say, the key rate (per pulse generated by the source laser) is,
\[ K(T_E) = P [I(A : B_2) - \chi(B_2 : EF)] \]
where \( f \) is the decoding reconciliation efficiency, and \( P \) is the probability of creating one photon in the PS. However, calculation of the key rate for a non-Gaussian state is analytically not tractable since the non-Gaussian state has more than two nonzero moments. To make progress, we utilize the Gaussian state (metrics of which will be indicated by the subscript G) that produces the same covariance matrix \( M \) as the non-Gaussian state \( |\psi\rangle_{AB2EF} \). This provides a lower bound for the key rate by the theorem of Gaussian optimality [31]. That is we can write
\[ K(T_E) \geq P [I_G(A : B_2) - \chi_G(B_2 : EF)] \]
where [13]
\[ I_G(A : B_2) = \frac{1}{2} \log_2 \frac{V_{B_2}}{V_{B_2}|A} \]
and the conditional variance \( V_{B_2}|A \) is
\[ V_{B_2}|A = V_{B_2} - \frac{C_{AB2}}{V_A} \].

For Eve’s stolen information, we can write
\[ \chi_G(B_2 : EF) = \sum_i g(v_i^{EF}) - \sum_j g(v_j^{EF}|B_2) \]
where
\[ g(v) = \frac{v + 1}{2} \log_2 \frac{v + 1}{2} - \frac{v - 1}{2} \log_2 \frac{v - 1}{2} \].

VI. SIMULATION RESULTS

For comparison purposes we first consider a non-variable attenuation channel where the channel transmissivity is fixed to some value in the range 0 to 1. Having done this, we compare the performance of our three schemes for the satellite channel we have discussed earlier in the paper.

Unless otherwise stated, the parameters utilized in the calculations shown are \( \alpha^2 = 1.3 \), \( f = 0.95 \), and \( \beta^2 = 0.01 \). The infinite summation limits are constrained to 10 for \( n \) and
As stated, we first consider a fixed attenuation channel. We plot the key rate against transmissivity in Fig. (3), and against distance in Fig. (4). In Fig. (4) we assume that the channel has a fixed attenuation of $0.2\text{dB/km}$. The results of Figs. (3)-(4) show that the R-PS scheme has the longest key distribution range at a cost of a reduced key rate. That is, the R-PS scheme is in some sense the most robust against channel attenuation (provides a non-zero key rate at the largest distance). We further compare the performance of the three schemes as a function of the noise $\beta^2$ and the mean photon number $\alpha^2$ (i.e. $\sinh^2 r$, $r$ being the squeezing parameter) - the results of which are shown in Figs. (5) and (6), respectively. Note, that in these figures the rates are not plotted in the logarithmic domain so the comparison in the small rate region is not as apparent.

When the noise parameter $\beta^2$ is large, we find distances where the T-PS scheme shows better key rate performance than the other schemes. We also find the T-PS and R-PS schemes also outperform the No-PS scheme in the low-squeezing region.

We next investigate the key rates of the three schemes in the variable Earth-satellite channel, calculating their average key rates under different average channel fluctuations, quantified using $\sigma_b$ within equations (1)- (2). These results are shown in Fig. (7). The No-PS case shows better performance in terms of key rate for the entire range of channel conditions - a result not found for the fixed attenuation case. The PS cases (T-PS and R-PS) are impacted by the low probability of obtaining a subtracted photon in any given pulse, and this effect dominates even when channel averaging over the fading channel is accounted for. The dashed curve in Fig. (7) shows the impact of a quantum memory in place such that the low probability for PS can be negated. Here the schemes are assumed to be a priori storing the required states in memory, then sending the same rate of quantum states into the satellite channel on-demand. A close up at low $\sigma_b$ is shown in Fig. (8) for different noise conditions. These results show the rates possible in very-high quality downlinks from the satellite-to-Earth.

A main aim of our study was to determine whether PS at the transmitter-side outperforms PS at the receiver-side for a range of Earth-Satellite channels. Figs. (7)-(8) provide a clear answer to this question - yes. The T-PS scheme is approximately a factor of two better than the R-PS scheme over all Earth-satellite channels investigated.

Note that $\sigma_b = 1$ corresponds to approximately 5dB of loss. Such low loss rates are possible for well-engineered systems in which diffraction of the beam is the major factor contributing to photon loss.
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